DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 680 EA 020 954

AUTHOR Maddaus, John
TITLE Residential Mobility and School Enrollment.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization (Stratton Mountain, VT, April 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Family Income; *Mobility; Racial Bias; *Residential Patterns; *School Choice; *Social Values; Socioeconomic Status; Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *New York (Syracuse)

ABSTRACT

Executives on the move are not the only groups interested in incorporating school enrollment into their decisions about housing choices. This paper examines this question and three others involving (1) types of families considering school enrollment in making housing decisions; (2) the criteria entering into parents' decisions; and (3) the implications for public policy and educational practice. The paper uses data collected as part of a study of elementary school enrollment by families in Syracuse, New York. Since the study's primary goal was to understand parental perspectives concerning school choice, the research method was both qualitative and field-based. Indepth interviewing was selected as the most efficient data collection method. Five predominantly white neighborhoods, ranging from low income to upper-middle income, were selected, and 39 families were interviewed. Results show that parents with financial means can and frequently do consider school enrollment while making housing decisions, whereas families with very limited incomes are prevented by limited housing options from doing likewise. Furthermore, those who do consider schools act on a wide range of criteria. Finally, given the presence of tacit assumptions about schools and the relative difficulty of obtaining some kinds of school information, even relatively affluent families may base their decisions on incomplete or inaccurate information. Many white middle-income parents consider themselves unprejudiced, but perceive the presence of black and poor students as undesirable. One reason that parental choice of schools has been seldom implemented is that most affluent families have already exercised choice by means of their housing choices. Also, school desegregation advocates may fear "white flight." Included are 4 appendices (tables) and 16 references. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307680

Residential Mobility and School Enrollment

by

John Maddaus

Department of Cultural Foundations and Curriculum

School of Education

Syracuse University

Syracuse, NY 13210

prepared for presentation at

the 1987 annual meeting of the

New England Educational Research Organization

Stratton Mountain, Vermont

April, 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Maddaus

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 050 454

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Almost thirty years ago, as suburban communities were mushrooming and the baby boom generation was entering schools in record numbers, Benjamin and Lillian Fine (1959, p. 120) advised parents:

> "...when you are looking for a home in the suburbs, near a bus stop, not far from a railroad terminal and in a respectable neighborhood, in the right price range, the question of a good school system too often gets lost in the shuffle. It shouldn't. Nothing is more important for you than the schools your children will inherit by your move. And nothing is more difficult than to try to analyze the kind of program your community offers."

They then described the process they had gone through and the criteria they had used when they moved from New York City out to the Long Island suburbs. This process included compiling a check list for evaluating a school system consisting of six major sections ("1. teaching staff; 2. community-school relations; 3. the children; 4. curriculum; 5. buildings and equipment; 6. miscellaneous" (p. 122)), and then visiting various schools.

A new industry has emerged in recent years of which Benjamin and Lillian Fine were in a sense the fore-runners: educational consulting. While real estate firms have for many years sought to promote the sale of homes in certain communities based on the reputations of their schools, educational consultants rely on much more than reputation, providing parents with detailed information on schools in various communities. Whether employed by real estate firms or self-employed, the new educational consultants provide "a service to save time for executives on the move" which has "become a standard part of the incentives offered to transferred families" by corporate employers (Magubane, 1985). One such service, provided by New Horizons of Westport, CT, has an advisory board consisting of former school administrators and offers computer printouts on

schools in an area geared to the interests of particular families. According to New Horizons' manager of Family Relocation Center Programs, Frank Morin,

> "Families who are moving... always stress the importance of good schools in their new communities. While it is difficult to determine what makes a good school system,... a number of factors are considered good barometers, including the tax support for educational programs, opportunity for acceleration, enrichment programs, services for gifted and handicapped students and community participation in the schools. Parents armed with this information can make a better choice."

What is the relationship between residential mobility and school enrollment? Are "executives on the move" a rare breed, relatively unique in their concern for incorporating school enrollment into their decisions about choice of housing? Or is New Horizons just the tip of the iceberg, the most visible sign that many families, not just corporate executives, consider school enrollment in their housing decisions?

This paper demonstrates that considering school enrollment in making housing decisions is not an isolated phenomenon. This in turn suggests other questions: Are some families more likely to make such decisions than others, and if so, why? Do parents base their decisions primarily on the kinds of criteria cited by Benjamin and Lillian Fine and by Frank Morin, or are there other criteria which enter into their decisions as well? And finally, what are the implications for public policy and educational practice of such private choices?

Research Design:

This paper will address these questions based on data collected as part of a study of elementary school enrollment by families in Syracuse, NY. The primary goal of this study was to obtain a better understanding of parental perspectives on school enrollment with regard to such issues as whether they felt they had

any choice of school, what schools they considered, how they obtained information and what criteria they felt were important. Therefore, the research approach adopted was qualitative and field-based. Since the events of interest took place in a variety of settings (e.g. homes, informal neighborhood gatherings, parent visits to schools, contacts with real estate agents) over a period of months to years, in-depth interviewing was selected as the most efficient means of gathering data.

Five predominantly white neighborhoods in one section of the city of Syracuse, ranging from low income to upper middle income, were selected for the study. During the spring and early summer of 1984, door-to-door surveys were conducted in each of these neighborhoods. Parents were asked for school enrollment information for each of their elementary school aged children for the school year just ending (1983-84) and for the coming year (1984-85). The results of this survey for 1983-84, covering 227 children from 161 families, are summarized in Appendix A. Parents were also asked how long they had lived at their current addresses and in the city. The results of these questions are contained in Appendix B.

In-depth interviews were then conducted with thirty-nine families who had indicated, in their responses to the survey, that they were in some situation of transition or uncertainty with respect to school enrollment. These situations included, in addition to changes in residence, entry into Kindergarten, voluntary transfers under the Syracuse City School District's "racial balance" program, transfers from public to private schools, transfers from private to public schools, transfers among private schools, and transfers related to special education placements.

The interviews consisted of three major sections. First, parents were asked to give detailed accounts of pre-school and elementary school enrollment for

each of their children. Secondly, families were asked for their views on a range of school enrollment policy alternatives. And thirdly, parents were asked for family background data, which is summarized in Appendix C. A second round of interviews was completed with thirty-seven of the families the following fall and winter, during which parents were asked about a number of issues identified by preliminary analysis of the first round of interviews.

Finally, data on housing sale prices in each of the neighborhoods during the period from April, 1984 through March, 1985 was obtained from a Syracuse newspaper and from one of the parents interviewed who happened to be a real estate agent.

Of the thirty-nine families with whom interviews were conducted, five had just moved into their present homes and two others moved shortly after the initial interviews. Another family had their house up for sale at the time of the interviews but did not end up selling it. Twelve additional families had lived in their present homes for two years or less, and ten families indicated during the interviews that they were considering moving in the foreseeable future (two of whom actually moved before the completion of the second round of interviews). Every parent interviewed had some comment to make about residential mobility, and in a majority of the interviews these comments wer quite extensive.

Question 1: Do substantial numbers of families consider school enrollment in making decisions about housing?

Findings of prior research: Two recent studies of school enrollmetn indicate that a majority of public school parents do consider school enrollment in making housing decisions. Wimpelberg (1982) conducted a study in Chicago in which "parents were asked if any characteristics of their present school or district influenced their decision to move to the current residential location or remain

there" (p. 12). He reports that 58.1% of the parents interviewed, all of whom had children in fifth grade in public schools, responded affirmatively to this question (Table 2, p. 17). A similar result is reported by Darling-Hammond and Kirby (1985) from their study of school enrollment in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. These researchers identified parents who "had considered public school quality as an important factor in determining residential location" (p. 8). They found that 53.1% of public school parents and 35.0% of private school parents belonged in this category (Table 3, p. 10).

The finding that 50-60% of public school parents consider school enrollment in their housing decisions appears to be inconsistent with findings of a study of housing choices conducted during the 1950's in Philadelphia by Rossi (1955, 1980). Rossi asked people who had recently moved whether, with respect to their previous homes, they were "satisfied, dissatisfied or it doesn't matter" with regard to fourteen characteristics. With respect to schools, only 6% expressed dissatisfaction, while 41% were indifferent (p. 231). He also asked whether the residence selected was better than, the same as, or worse than the "second best place you looked at" with respect to a variety of characteristics. The new residence was rated better than the second choice considered with respect to schools by 28% of respondents (p. 212) and worse by 8% of respondents (p. 214). Since schools rated lower compared to most other items on most questions, and since the 41% indifferent was much higher than any other characteristic, Rossi concludes that schools "are not considered very important. They are apparently not very salient features of homes" (p. 215).

One other, very narrowly focused body of research should be noted with respect to this issue. James S. Coleman (1975) has suggested that many white families were moving to the suburbs rather than permit their children to attend newly desegregated urban schools, a phenomenon known as "white flight". But

subsequent research by Farley (1978) has indicated that major desegregation orders typically result in an incremental loss of white students equal to one year's normal loss of white students as a result of other, long-term trends such as urban-suburban migration and low birth rates (cited in Simpson and Yinger, 1985).

Findings of this study: Some families move primarily because of dissatisfaction with their children's schools, although they appear to be a relatively small minority, in part because such dissatisfactions may also be resolved in other ways. A significantly larger number of families move primarily for other reasons but give some amount of consideration to schools in deciding on a new home. In some cases, parents say they consider schools but actually proceed largely on the assumption that a "good" neighborhood will have "good" schools, and therefore do not investigate the schools very carefully. In some cases, families decide on homes despite what they have learned about the schools, either because they decide to pursue other values instead or because they cannot afford a home in a neighborhood with better schools. Finally, some parents do not consider schools at all in their housing decisions.

Discussion: Rossi makes two useful distinctions in discussing the reasons for residential mobility. The first distinction is between "free choice" moves (i.e. those motivated by a search for better housing) and "forced" moves (p. 184). In this study, four of the ten moves which actually occurred during the year when interviews were being conducted were what Rossi considers "forced" moves. Two moves were the consequences of inter-city job changes, one was the result of the demolition of a building in which a family had been renting an apartment, and one was a consequence of a change in marital status. Thirty-nine percent of the moves in Rossi's study were of this type. Although it is conceivable that such "forced" moves could be the result of perceptions of school enrollment (e.g. a

single mother might marry someone because she thought he would enable her and her child to live in a better neighborhood with better schools), Rossi does not consider this possibility, and indeed this was not the case for the four families in this study.

The second distinction which Rossi makes is with regard to the "impact" of a complaint about a family's former residence. He distinguishes between a "primary" complaint (i.e. one which is an important reason for deciding to move), a "contributory" complaint (i.e. not an important reason, but "the thing which started him thinking") and an "ineffective" complaint (i.e. not important in any way) (pp. 187-8). Of the six families in this study who made "free choice" moves during 1984, only one indicated that schools were a primary complaint. Three other families were not satisfied with their neighborhood public schools, but had previously resolved that problem in other ways, either through voluntary transfer or private school enrollment. Two families who considered moving at the time of the interviews but did not do so resolved their school enrollment problems in these same ways. Thus, a change of residence is but one of several ways in which families can deal with their dissatisfactions about a school in those cases in which problems cannot be resolved by dealing directly with the teachers and/or principal.

Whether or not schools play any part in a family's departure from their previous home, they may be a factor in the decision about what home to move into. Take, for example, the case of Claudia Swanson, the one parent who reported that her family was moving primarily because of schools. Asked what they did first when they decided to move, Claudia replied,

> "The first thing we did was to look into school systems outside the city. We visited Bannerton, Littleton and Lincolnville. I went to Bannerton myself, when I was in school, but it's changed so much. I also called Norwood and Eddington. Norwood has been in the papers so much. You now have to pay $40

for each [extra-curricular] activity you join there. We also looked into Benson by talking with friends. And we drove past Benson High School. That scared me, the size of it. Littleton was the best. And we were able to find the house that we wanted in the area that we wanted because of its school."

In short, Claudia Swanson and her husband carried out an extensive search of six suburban, rural and small city school districts before deciding on a small rural district. Only then did they begin looking at houses.

But the Swanson family was an exception. Most families made few, if any, specific inquiries about schools before deciding on their new homes, and none of the others decided on a geographic area based on school attendance boundaries before looking at specific houses. Consider, for example, the case of Marvin and Denise Lake, who were interviewed just before moving to another city. Marvin is a successful business executive who had already begun working at a new job and had also taken primary responsibility for finding a new home for their family. Marvin had been very active in the affairs of the school previously attended by their two children. His wife, Denise, had been a teacher for over ten years. Neither Marvin's parents nor Denise's had gone beyond high school, and both they and Marvin's parents attributed his successful career to his having gotten a good education. Yet despite the very high value which the entire family placed on education, the sequence of decisions when they moved was: (1) Marvin's job; (2) community; (3) house and (4) school. But when asked whether their decisions about a school and a house constrained their decisions about school enrollment, Marvin replied,

"Not really. Certain kinds of community foster certain kinds of school. The better the socio-economic conditions of an area, the better the schools. In the city we're moving to, there are very stark contrasts."

The idea that "certain kinds of community foster certain kinds of school" is an example of what Rossi refers to as a "tacit assumption" in housing choice. Tacit assumptions refer to those criteria which "are so completely taken for granted that they are not mentioned as specifications" (p. 204). He offers as an example the existence of a bathroom within a house or apartment. But tacit assumptions are not limited to features of the dwelling itself. "Tacit assumptions, for example, are held concerning the location of the dwelling. Not all areas of the city are considered, only those within some range of acceptability" (p. 204). Rossi adds that about one-fourth of the families interviewed in his study were looking for new homes only within specific neighborhoods, and he speculates that in most cases these limitations on their searches were made "because the neighborhoods symbolized an especially desired 'social climate', rather than some aspect of accessibility either to friends or to their jobs" (p. 203). In the case of Marvin and Denise Lake, an assumption about schools also contributed to making some neighborhoods seem more desirable than others. This suggests a better explanation than the one Rossi offers for why relatively few families reported any differences between their first and second housing choices with respect to schools. Rather than schools and neighborhoods being unimportant, as Rossi suggests, it may be that they are so important that families will automatically reject any house that is located in what they believe is not a good neighborhood with a good school.

Dealing with any characteristic of a home by means of tacit assumptions has at least one significant drawback from the point of view of those involved: one's assumption may prove incorrect. Several families in one of the neighborhoods in this study, "Hilltop", made the assumption that since the neighborhood was a good one -- safe, secure, friendly, with lots of children -- it was sure to have a good school. Indeed, there was a public school in a nice area only three

blocks away. Only after they bought their homes and moved in did they discover that they were supposed to send their children to another school located in a low income neighborhood almost a mile away. As Leah Mills, a Hilltop parent, explained,

> "We knew about both schools when we moved here. But we thought the children went to the school you lived near. And we were so close to Hoover School, just three blocks away. We never thought of boundary lines. We were naive. We'll never make that mistake again."

Leah and Clifford Mills, like many other parents in Hilltop, resolved this problem initially by enrolling their children in a nearby Catholic school. But they became dissatisfied with that school, and at the time of the initial interview they had their house on the market, intending to move to a nearby suburb. But when they didn't get the offer they had been hoping for, they ended up applying for a voluntary transfer instead.

Some parents considered schools but made their decisions about housing based on other criteria. For example, when Andrew Vail and his wife moved to Syracuse with their children, the first homes they looked at were in two affluent suburbs. As Andrew described it,

> "At the time we moved here, we went to two real estate agents. They both took us to Bennett Center and Irving. They told us, 'This is the only place to live'. The major selling point was the schools. And in part it is kind of correct. People who happen to be interested in education move out there. The real estate people say, 'You don't like this house? Take it anyway. Because of the schools.' We looked out there. But we didn't like it. We're not country people."

Although Andrew is a well-paid professional and they could well afford a home in these suburbs, Andrew and Roberta Vail preferred the convenience of

living in the city close to work and cultural activities. Later, faced with a city school they regarded as unacceptable, they thought of moving but chose to enroll their child in a private school instead. But with younger children to think of as well, they are considering a future move to the suburbs, where they believe the public schools are superior.

All four of these families could truthfully say that they had "considered" school enrollment in making their housing choices, although the ways in which they thought about schools and the impact of schools on their housing decisions were all quite different. There were, however, families in this study for whom schools played no part whatever in their housing decisions. The reasons for this are explored in the next section.

Question 2: What factors influence whether or not a family will consider school enrollment in making their housing decisions?

Findings of prior research: Wimpelberg (1982) reports that 40% of the families in his study in which neither parent had gone beyond high school said that they had considered schools in their housing decisions, whereas for families in which one or both parents had at least a bachelor's degree, this figure was 77.6% (Table 2, p. 17). Darling-Hammond and Kirby (1985) report that the mother's level of education is more strongly associated with considering schools and housing together than is the father's. In families in which the mother was not a high school graduate, only 30.8% report considering schools in connection with housing. However, 72.4% of families in which the mother had at least a bachelor's degree considered schools and housing together. For father's level of education, the comparable figures are 47.5% and 68.3%. Darling-Hammond and Kirby also report that higher percentages of families at higher income levels had considered schools in their housing decisions, although the association with income is weaker than for

education: 40.9% for families with annual incomes under $15,000, as compared with 58.7% for families with incomes over $50,000 (Table 3, p. 10).

Findings of this study: Money, or the lack of it, was the most important constraint on considering school enrollment in housing decisions. Other factors which had an influence on such decisions include the extent to which parents (1) felt competent to evaluate schools; (2) had access to relevant information about schools; and (3) placed a high value on specific attributes of schools.

Discussion: All of the families quoted in the preceding section had annual incomes of at least $20,000, and three of the four had incomes of $40,000 or more. Such incomes permit parents greater discretion in making housing decisions. By way of contrast, three families in this study with incomes in the $15-20,000 range, all of whom had at some point rented apartments in the suburbs, moved into the city because they were able to get better housing there for less money. In all three cases, these families expressed a preference for suburban schools and looked forward to moving back to the suburbs if and when they could afford the higher cost of housing there.

The significance of financial constraints was even more evident among families in this study with incomes below $15,000, all eight of whom lived in the lowest income neighborhood, "Old Town". Most of these families expressed a desire to move, either to a better neighborhood within the city or to the suburbs or the country. They felt that life would be safer and more peaceful if they could make such a move, and four of them specifically mentioned better schools. But they felt that they simply could not afford to make such a move. For example, Ruth Ball, a single mother who has been on and off welfare because of health problems, commented,

"This used to be a pretty nice neighborhood, but it's getting worse. The

city's no place to raise decent kids any more. You can do it, but it's harder. I heard about a program where low income people can move to the suburbs. I wouldn't mind that. I hear the Paineville schools are excellent."

Ruth Ball had become dissatisfied with the public school in her neighborhood, and had enrolled her child in one of the city's two magnet schools. She spoke of wanting to send him to a military academy, where she thought he would get the discipline she believed he needed, but she could not afford to do so. Moving to Paineville would have been a satisfactory alternative, but she had little hope of being able to do that either.

Financial constraints on school enrollment for low income families are also evident in the low rate of private school enrollment for families in Old Town, as indicated in Appendix A. Only seven of the 71 children (10%) identified through the survey in this neighborhood attended Catholic schools, while the two children in other private schools were both in publically funded special education programs. By way of comtrast, 21% of the city's elementary school children attend private (mostly Catholic) schools, and in higher income neighborhoods within the same school attendance area -- Parkside and Hilltop -- private school attendance reaches 50% of the total elementary school population. Of the twelve families in Old Town who were interviewed, seven expressed a preference for private (mostly Catholic) schools, but only one family had actually enrolled their child in a Catholic school.

Low income families did move, of course. In fact, they moved more frequently than those with higher incomes, as indicated in Appendix B, but their moves were constrained by what they could afford. They were much more likely to be renters than home owners, and to think of their current homes as temporary. What schools their children would attend as a consequence of any particular move seemed less important because they didn't expect to stay there very long. Even so, they had

a tendency to move very short distances, sometimes only a block or two, with no resulting change in school attendance area. Some moves were the result of inability to pay the rent for their former apartments. And inadequate housing conditions, such as leaky roofs, unsafe wiring and lack of insulation (resulting in high utility bills), tended to overshadow other concerns in making decisions about whether to leave and where to go.

While financial problems and poor housing conditions tended to dominate the housing choices of low income families, there are also other explanations for why such families may not have been as likely as more affluent families to consider schools in making housing decisions. One important factor that seems significant in this regard is a parent's sense of their own level of competence with respect to a school enrollment decision.

Ruth Ball, for example, clearly felt that she was competent to make such a decision on behalf of her son. Although she could not afford a home in a better neighborhood or a private school, she did insist that he be transferred to another public school when he was experiencing academic problems in the fourth grade which she attributed largely to the neighborhood school's open classroom design. Her confidence in her own judgment in this situation was due in part to what she had learned as president of a Headstart parents group and also as a teacher aide in a CETA training program. She had also had a series of successful encounters with school officials, first as a student and later as a parent. Hence, she believed that she could "fight the system" and get the kind of school she felt her child needed.

Other Old Town parents were also skeptical of open classrooms and concerned about their children's academic difficulties in the neighborhood school, but were less confident about dealing with school related matters. For example, Joan

East also wanted her children in self-contained classrooms, and was considering requesting a transfer to another school for that reason. But she hesitated to do so. She was clearly uncomfortable dealing with school, which seemed to be related at least in part to having dropped out of school herself after the eighth grade. She spoke repeatedly during the interview of her frustrations at not being able to help her children with their homework, and commented that she would have to go back to school herself before she would be able to help them. She felt competent with regard to supervising her children at home (e.g. providing them with a small backyard pool to play in during the summer, not letting them roam the streets as some other neighborhood children did). She also felt able to teach them things that were unrelated to school (e.g. archery). But when it came to school related matters, including school enrollment, she was less sure of herself.

Another factor which influences whether parents will consider school enrollment in making decisions about housing is their access to specific information about schools. In this study, middle income families tended to have greater access to such information than low income families. In part, this was because middle income families were more comfortable about going to school (or calling school) and asking for information from teachers and administrators, who are their social peers. Middle income families may also get more information from reading printed school materials and newspapers, although such printed sources were relatively seldom mentioned as a source of useful information regarding school enrollment.

The biggest difference in access to school related information, however, is a consequence of differences in neighborhood social networks. In each of the neighborhoods in this study except Old Town, at least one of the parents interviewed was a teacher. Others had been teachers at one time. Not only did teachers and former teachers have more school related information themselves, but they were

frequently mentioned by other parents as sources of information. In addition, more middle income parents were involved in schools in voluntary capacities. Thus, most middle income parents, if they were not directly involved in schools themselves, knew at least one other person in their neighborhood who was.

Parents in Old Town were not entirely lacking in informal sources of information about schools. Two of those interviewed were or had been teacher aides. Others had taken part in the pre-Kindergarten program at the neighborhood school, and had learned about the school in that way. But there were fewer people with such useful information, what they knew was more limited, and they were more socially isolated from others in their neighborhood. Such social isolation was due in part to the general stressfulness of their lives, the frequency with which they moved and the limited resources they could contribute to informal exchanges with other families.

One might assume that moving from one community to another would disrupt a parent's access to informal sources of information about schools. However, to the extent that parents were well informed about schools in the community that they had left, they were able to acquire comparable information about schools in their nex communities rather quickly. For example, six families who had moved to Syracuse from other parts of the country were able to find out rather quickly which public schools were in good neighborhoods and what private schools were available in the city. They were less likely to be aware of the voluntary transfer program. Two of these parents, both of whom had come from communities with mandatory busing programs, assumed that the busing they observed in Syracuse was also mandatory.

Finally, parents are more likely, as in the case of Claudia Swanson, to consider schools in making decisions about housing if they place a high value on specific attributes of schools. Most parents in this study did have clear

criteria for selecting schools, and these will be discussed separately in the next section. However, some parents have more detailed ideas about what school should be like than others, and such detail, combined with the strength of commitment with which these criteria are held, makes a difference in how strongly school related considerations are weighed against other considerations in making decisions about housing.

Given the finding of this study that family income is the primary constraint on whether school enrollment is considered in housing decisions, how does one interpret the findings reported by Darling-Hammond and Kirby that such consideration of public schools is not strongly associated with family income but is strongly associated with parent's (especially mother's) education?

First, it must be noted that this study is limited by a process of self-selection. The parents who participated in this study were people who felt that they were reasonably competent as parents, who had something to say about schools and felt reasonably confident about saying it, and who were not intimidated by a stranger showing up on their doorsteps claiming to be from the university and asking lots of questions. Mothers who had not completed high school are underrepresented in this study (three mothers fit in this category, while two others dropped out but later got graduate equivalency diplomas), and those few who did participate may not accurately reflect the perspectives of those who did not. Furthermore, several of the mothers with a high school education or less, such as Ruth Ball, had had subsequent experiences which provided them with both information and self-confidence with respect to schools. Had it been possible to interview a larger and perhaps more representative sample of mothers with low levels of education, the effects of education on such factors as criteria, information and self-confidence might have been clearer.

However, the sample of parents interviewed by Darling-Hammond and Kirby

also includes very few mothers who were not high school graduates (25 out of 339 public school parents). This sample may also suffer from the limitations mentioned above, along with the additional limitation that they could only interview those people who had their own telephones. In addition, their sample includes everyone they contacted with a school aged child, regardless of how long ago they moved into their current residence or how long ago their children entered their present schools. In those cases in which there is a considerable lapse of time between the housing decision and the interview, some parents may have had difficulty recalling what they did. In addition, there is the difficulty of interpreting such imprecise terms as "considered" and "important". Finally, parents with higher levels of education may be more likely to believe that in order to appear to be responsible parents they should say that they considered public schools when moving (i.e. the problem of perceived interviewer expectations). Hence, it is possible that the data collected by Darling-Hammond and Kirby do not reflect what actually happened so much as they reflect what the people interviewed thought should have happened. Since mothers are more likely to have been interviewed than fathers, such perceptions would show up most strongly in the data on mother's education. If this is the case, responses in relation to family income would also vary, but less strongly, as a consequence of the loose association between mother's education and family income.

Question 3: What criteria do parents use when evaluating schools when making housing decisions?

Findings of prior research: While Darling-Hammond and Kirby asked questions regarding school enrollment criteria, they do not report the responses for the category of parents who said they considered school enrollment in making housing decisions. They do, however, report data on criteria for the overlapping category of "active school choosers" (i.e. those who considered "other schools at the time

of current schooling choice" - p. 8). For public school parents in that category, "the most important reason for current school choice" was "quality of school/ education/program" (59.8%), followed by "financial factors" (11.5%), "convenience/ proximity of school" (5.8%) and "family factors" (5.7%). For private school parents, the corresponding figures were "quality of school/education/program" (43.5%), "moral/religious factors" (17.4%) and "disciplinary standards" (15.2%) (Table 4, p. 13).

As noted above, James S. Coleman (1975) and other proponents of the "white flight" hypothesis have argued that factors associated with race are major considerations for some families leaving communities where school desegregation is under way.

In addition, the findings of other studies of school enrollment, although not dealing directly with its relationship to housing decisions, may be of some relevance to that specific situation. For example, Nault and Uchitelle (1982) interviewed parents living in "optional attendance zones" in the "Collegeville" school district. They asked parents to identify the most and least important criteria in their decisions from a list of fifteen items. The items most often selected were: "general atmosphere of the school", "principal's philosophy of education and attitude toward children", "overall curriculum and academic programs", and "child's teacher's personal teaching style and classroom skills" (p. 90).

Finally, Bridge and Blackman (1978) report that parents who participated in the Alum Rock (San Jose, CA) public school voucher demonstration project based their enrollment decisions primarily on school location, which was cited by 70.9% of the families interviewed. Program features, such as curriculum content and classroom organization, were cited by 32.0% of parents. Friends and family members were cited by 30.8% of parents, general school quality by 18.9%, and the principal and teachers by 18.0% (Table 15, p. 51).

Findings of this study: The most important criterion used by the parents in this study for selecting a school was the school "environment", which refers primarily to whether the children behaved according to standards the parents deemed appropriate and whether such behavior was expected and consistently rewarded by the teachers and other staff. Another, closely related, criterion was whether attendance at a school would contribute in some way to the child's "sense of community", as for example by strengthening friendships with other children in the same neighborhood. "Academics", including the teacher's instructional skills, curriculum content and special programs for gifted and handicapped children, was also considered important. Distance and convenience were also considerations. These parents stated that they were not prejudiced with respect to race.

Discussion: Questions of student behavior, both academic and social, were foremost in the minds of most parents in making decisions about school enrollment and housing choice. Claudia Swanson, for example, felt that the public schools in the city did not have sufficient authority over their students. She described the city school she thought was the best in this regard as follows:

> "The principal at Adams is the kind who tries to instill a little fear in the children. That won't hurt anyone. They have their own rules, and they list them in the newsletter they send home to parents. They post the rules too. And they make the children believe that the rules are enforced by the police."

But a good school is more than simply a clear and consistently enforced set of rules. Claudia Swanson believes that acceptable student behavior is more likely to be found in a smaller school where the adults know the children by name and deal with them as individuals, where teachers are involved in the community and spend time with students outside of regular school hours, where individual attention from adults is the reward for working hard and behaving appropriately. She

believes that Littleton, a small, rural school district, will provide her children with that combination of authority and caring that she finds lacking in the city schools.

Other parents were also concerned about student behavior, but thought that the critical issue was the standards of behavior that children brought with them to school from their homes. Thus, when asked whether they preferred a school in which the children came from homes which shared their values, as compared to a school in which the children came from diverse family backgrounds with different values, most parents preferred a concensus on shared values: respect for teachers and other adults, respect for other children, respect for personal property, a willingness to work hard. They wanted a school atmosphere in which their children would feel secure, which was conducive to learning, and in which their children would be expected to succeed academically. They felt that such conditions were more likely to exist if the other parents upheld the same values in their homes.

Parents also wanted teachers and other school staff to uphold the same set of values at school. But in the absence of support from parents, they questioned how effective the public schools could be in this regard. Some parents mentioned specific incidents that they had heard about, involving weapons (e.g. knives), stealing, hitting, pushing, bad language, loud noice, lack of respect for adults, and lack of interest in school work.

Other parents took no chances, proceding on the assumption that, in Marvin Lake's words, "the better the socio-economic conditions of an area, the better the schools". Rather than invest the time in visiting a particular school or take the risk of sending a child to a school that seemed unsafe, they did their best to avoid such schools. For example, when Cliff and Leah Mills discovered, after buying their present home, that they would be expected to send their children to a public school in a low income neighborhood about a mile away, they

immediately rejected that idea and set about seeking other alternatives. As Cliff explained,

> "We didn't like the neighborhood. We were concerned about our children's safety. The kids around there are street-wise, and our kids aren't. We didn't want them exposed to kids who are aggressive and bullying. We were afraid they would be picked on, and that they would be so concerned about their environment that they couldn't study. We didn't want them in that kind of environment.

Parents also viewed the general level of socio-economic conditions as important for other reasons. They were concerned about whether there was a "sense of community" in the neighborhood which would have a positive impact on child-rearing generally, outside the school as well as within it. They were concerned about whether the neighborhood was a safe place to live, with recreation programs and other kinds of formal activities as well as suitable friends for their children and supportive adult neighbors. Many of these parents prefer neighborhood schools which reflect the shared values of the neighborhood, provide a facility for neighborhood activities outside school hours, and offer opportunities for neighborhood friendships to be strengthened. These characteristics of neighborhood schools are important supports for child-rearing, and they may also encourage community support for the schools' main task of promoting learning.

"Academics" are the things most easily observed or talked about by parents investigating schools. This category of criteria includes most of the items on Benjamin and Lillian Fine's check list for new suburbanites in the 1950's and on the computer printouts which consultants provide for "executives on the move" in the 1980's. The curriculum is the easiest thing to identify, but it also tends to be the same for schools within a district, except perhaps for magnet schools

and for programs for the gifted and for children with handicapping conditions. Many parents think that the teachers' instructional skills are more important, and certainly more variable, but they are also harder to define precisely. The neighborhood "grapevine", despite its faults, tends to be regarded as the most accessible source of information about individual teachers. Some parents report that making a visit to a school to observe in a classroom is helpful, but since one can rarely observe in more than two or three classrooms, one runs the risk of forming an impression of the teaching staff of a school based on having observed those teachers who are most comfortable having parents come in and who are likely to be among the better teachers. Also, as Nault and Uchitelle point out, one is likely to observe in the grade one's child is about to enter, which in many cases is Kindergarten, and have little idea about the teachers in the higher grades. Given such limitations on what can be learned from visiting schools, some parents rely on tacit assumptions about neighborhood socio-economic conditions or on "indicators" such as teacher salary levels and district per pupil expenditures to judge the academic quality as well as the environment of schools or districts.

The importance of "location" in the Alum Rock public school voucher demonstration reported by Bridge and Blackman is probably based at least in part on the tacit assumptions about neighborhoods and schools just described. For parents such as Claudia Swanson, who investigate schools before narrowing their search for a new home to a particular geographic area, the distance between home and school per se is obviously not a factor in the school enrollment decision. But for families who consider homes and schools simultaneously, it is possible that distance could be a factor, as for example in choosing a home and school within walking distance of each other over a home and school that were farther apart and required a child to ride a bus to school each day. Once a family has

selected a particular home, distance was an important factor in parents' decisions about whether to apply for a transfer and to which school(s).

As Benjamin and Lillian Fine illustrate with their example of a Long Island commuter considering access to bus and rail facilities, convenience is clearly a consideration in housing choice. In this study, there is also evidence to suggest that convenience is a consideration in school enrollment, including those cases involving residential mobility. For example, Claudia Swanson chose the school district where her aunt lived, and Cliff and Leah Mills were thinking of moving to the school district where he had lived as a teenager and where his parents still lived. In both cases, the presence of relatives meant that school related information on which to base an enrollment decision was more readily available, as was information which might prove useful later on after the children were enrolled.

The issue of racial prejudice and the related phenomenon of "white flight" are very complex and subject to numerous interpretations. Only one of the parents interviewed volunteered the comment that he found himself feelinf prejudiced. He explained this feeling by referring to racial tensions which had existed in a public housing project where he had lived as a child. On the other hand, about half the parents interviewed volunteered some comment to the effect that they were not prejudiced (None of these parents used the terms "racist" or "racism" in these interviews.). However, these families lived in predominantly, if not exclusively, white neighborhoods, and usually spoke of black people collectively rather than of individual black persons. While most of these parents had children in public schools in which at least 20% of the students were black, they seemed uncomfortable about that fact, as indicated by numerous comments about the effect black students might have on either the environment or academics of those schools. Some of those parents also expressed similar concerns about white children from

low income families, indicating that they felt the real problem was not race but the behavior and values of low income families generally.

About half the parents interviewed indicated that they saw some advantages to some diversity of students in their children's schools, especially in teaching them to get along with a diversity of people when they became adults. But very few parents expressed a definite preference for racially integrated schools, and one of these, Vivian Kite, enrolled her child (for other reasons) in a Catholic school that had few if any black students. As she summed up her decision,

> "I have no qualms about an integrated school. In fact, I prefer it. I'm very senstive to people thinking I'm sending Elaine to St. Oscar's to avoid integration. I'm not. But am I supposed to sacrifice Elaine's needs to create an ideal society?"

Vivian did consider an inner city Catholic school where over 75% of the students were balck. She rejected it for a number of reasons, including the low academic level of many of the students, the aging physical facilities and the distance from home, adding,

> "If you're going to do that, it would be best to move to the inner city. But then there's the quality of life to take into account. It would be nice if St. Oscar's were integrated, but it isn't. What it comes down to is that it's an issue I've postponed dealing with."

Schools such as St. Oscar's reflect the prevailing housing patterns in Syracuse, which provide limited options for black and low income families. Such housing patterns may reflect in part the association in the minds of many middle income white parents between race, family income and standards of behavior.

If, by prejudice, one means the assumption that just because a child is black that child will necessarily behave in certain ways, then perhaps these white parents are not prejudiced. Their thinking about black children is more

complex than that, taking into account family income, parental values and the standards and expectations of school staff. But they do regard the probability of unacceptable social behavior and poor academic performance as greater for children from low income families in general and black children from such families in particular. Beyond some point, which varies from family to family, they are unwilling to risk their own children's well-being by enrolling them in schools with "too many" black and/or low income children. They would regard themselves as irresponsible parents if they did so.

Question 4: What are the implications for policy and for practice of research on housing choice and school enrollment?

Recommendations from prior research: Some researchers have made sweeping policy recommendations based on the findings of their research and their own ethical beliefs, whereas others have left it to their readers to infer what policies might be appropriate based on the factual conclusions of their research and the readers' ethical principles.

Darling-Hammond and Kirby do not make any specific policy recommendations based on the findings of their study, which has as its primary policy focus the Minnesota state income tax deduction for educational expenses which was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1983. However, they do report several conclusions from which their readers may reach their own policy conclusions. For example, they note that "households who choose with their feet had a lower propensity of choosing private schools, having selected the community that best fit their needs" (p. 37). Depending on the readers' views of public versus private education, they could argue from this finding for various policies with respect to residential mobility.

Nault and Uchitelle, in the conclusion to their study of optional attendance

zones in a public school district, comment that "those who advocate school assignment based on client sovereignty rather than on place of residence, in the belief that the resulting school diversity will yield more productive or satisfying school-family matches, should draw comfort from this investigation" (p. 96). But they add, "We stress again the atypical characteristics of the parent populations" (mostly highly educated professionals), and suggest that "parents who are less well educated... may be less systematic" in their decision-making.

Bridge (1978) addresses what he regards as a significant problem with respect to less well educated parents in an article which focuses on policy issues regarding postsecondary education entitlement programs but which draws heavily on data from the Alum Rock elementary school voucher demonstration. Bridge argues that "information imperfections" (i.e. incomplete or inaccurate information about schools and school enrollment policies) are "a potentially fatal short-coming" of voucher systems for "low income, less educated, less socially advantaged Americans" (p. 523). He also proposes a standard of "legitimacy" with respect to parental choices funded by government vouchers: "their choices must be appropriate in the sense that the training they purchase contributes to their future economic leverage". He therefore concludes that "postsecondary entitlements should not be implemented until effective policies to overcome information imperfections have been developed in experimental programs", a conclusion which he appears to view as appropriate for elementary school vouchers as well.

Finally, James S. Coleman (1981) argues that "rigid assignment by residence", contrary to common assumption, "increases inequality of educational opportunity", since only those who are affluent can afford the remaining options of "choosing a school by choice of residence" or choosing "to attend a private school" (p. 162). He

advocates "an abandonment of the principle of assignment by residence" as part of a fundamental reorganization of American education, suggesting that "the educational choice for all that is now available only to those with money" be one of the "elements of a successful reorganization" (p. 164).

Recommendations from this study: I believe that those who conduct research related to important policy issues should also make explicit both the ethical principles which they believe apply to those issues and the policy recommendations which they believe are approrpiate given both these ethical principles and their factual knowledge of the subject. I will attempt to do so here.

State legislation should be developed, adopted and implemented which would permit all parents, regardless of race, to enroll their children in any public school within their state, subject to the limitation that immediate priority would always be given to area residents over transfers. Buildings and districts receiving enrollment applications in excess of current building capacity would be required to expand their capacity as rapidly as possible, and state aid would be provided for this purpose. Free transportation should be provided within a radius of fifteen miles, also financed by the state. State aid to school districts experiencing net changes in enrollment should be adjusted insofar as possible to reflect incremental changes in actual instructional and related costs.

In addition, policies should be adopted by local boards of education providing maximum feasible opportunities for all parents to obtain information about schools, subject to the restriction that such information-gathering activities not result in any disruption of instructional activities. Teachers and other school personnel should receive appropriate training with respect to such procedures, as well as training which would aid them in promoting collaborative relationships with parents in all aspects of parent-teacher relationships.

Schools and other community organizations should expand their efforts in

parenting education, focusing on the following areas: (1) parenting skills and activities in the home which may be educational although not necessarily school related; (2) parents activities supporting school instruction and developing collaboration with teachers and other school staff; and (3) parental decision-making with respect to school enrollment.

School and other community organizations should seriously address, through discussions involving all sections of their communities, the major social issues which have an impact on school enrollment, including standards of acceptable behavior, housing opportunities and employment opportunities.

Parents should consider their ethical responsibilities, not only to their own children but also to other children in their communities, with respect to their school enrollment decisions.

Discussion: The major conclusion of this study is that parents who have the financial means to do so can and frequently do take school enrollment into consideration while making housing decisions, whereas families with very limited incomes are prevented by the limited housing options available from doing likewise, even if they so desire. Furthermore, those who do consider schools in making housing decisions act on a wide range of criteria, some of which may be considered more "legitimate" than others. And finally, given the prevalence of tacit assumptions about schools and the related difficulty of obtaining some kinds of school related information, even relatively affluent families may base their decisions on incomplete or inaccurate information.

While there are differences between the "average" affluent, well educated family and the "average" family that has less income and lower levels of education with respect to choice of criteria, amount and accuracy of information, feelings of personal competence and the like, some of these differences simply reflect different opportunities and different needs. Furthermore, within each category of

parents there is a very considerable range with respect to criteria, information and so on. What distinguishes the affluent from the less affluent, more than anything else, is that the former are much more likely than the latter to be able to acquire the home in the neighborhood with the school that meets their needs and those of their children as they perceive them.

Another important conclusion of this study is that many white middle income parents, although thinking of themselves as not being prejudiced, do perceive the presence of black students and students from low income families generally as increasing the risk of school problems with respect to both academic performance and social behavior. As Yinger (1986) notes, real estate agents are sensitive to such perceptions, and they are likely to respond by practicing subtle forms of discrimination on the basis of race (such as not showing black families houses which they could afford in predominantly white neighborhoods).

In ethical terms, I believe that these findings raise issues of fairness or justice. Some families have much greater opportunities to enroll their children in the schools of their choice through their selection of housing (or through private school enrollment) than other families do. Furthermore, while the more affluent families may assert that their opportunities are earned through hard work, I believe that the poor, and especially the minority poor, are disadvantaged by discrimination, by limited access to informal assistance and by misfortune (e.g. poor health) as much or more than by their lack of effort. And insofar as opportunities are in fact restricted by the parents' own short-comings, their children should not be forced to suffer the consequences. Thus, I believe that some compensatory action to increase school enrollment opportunties for those who presently lack them is ethically justified.

Since both income and race are related to lack of housing opportunity, one possible option would be a system of transfers under which a family would become

eligible under either of these criteria. Advocates of using a racial balance criterion only may argue that white low income white people may be able to increase their incomes, black people cannot change their race. However, I believe that this comparison underestimates both the limitations on job opportunities for low income white families, especially those in which the mother is the primary or sole source of support, and the economic power and increasing residential mobility of the growing number of relatively affluent black people.

There is a problem with restricting transfers based on one or both of these criteria, no matter how valid they may appear from the data: some families may genuinely experience limitations on their housing choices but fail to meet eligibility standards under a restricted transfer program. Rather than deny transfers to such families, I would prefer to see options available to all.

Interestingly, the concept of unrestricted parental choice among public schools has been advocated in recent years by a number of prominent leaders in educational policy-making, among them Michael Kirst (a researcher and writer in educational policy studies as well as past president of the California State Board of Education) (1981), President Reagan (1985), Albert Shanker (president of the American Federation of Teachers) (1985) and the National Governors' Association (1986). While these policy-makers have all endorsed the same concept, their reasons for doing so vary. Kirst and Shanker are advocates of public education who view who view parental choice in public education as a means of reducing public pressure for parental choice programs which would include private schools. The National Governors' Association report excludes private schools from parental choice programs based on constitutional grounds, while adopting the parental involvement and excellence arguments promoted by advocates of vouchers. President Reagan, on the other hand, has endorsed parental choice in public education as part of a campaign that would establish public support for parental choice in both public and private sectors.

With such prominent supporters of the concept of parental choice among public schools, it is interesting to speculate about why the concept has so seldom been implemented to date. One explanation is suggested by the findings of this research: most affluent families have already exercised parental choice among public schools by means of their housing choices. Such families do not require a transfer program in order to enroll their children in the schools of their choice. In fact, neighborhood schools are preferable to school transfers in any case, provided one can afford to live in the neighborhood one prefers, since, since neighborhood schools can more easily contribute to other child-rearing objectives than can schools at a distance from home. Moreover, middle income families, having chosen to live in certain neighborhoods and send their children to the neighborhood schools, may wish to restrict access to those schools by children from less affluent families coming from less affluent neighborhoods. This analysis is confirmed by the history of resistance to urban-suburban school desegregation programs. For those who are satisfied with their present public schools, there is little to be gained and possibly something to be lost by opening up their schools to transfers. Until such time as such parents' perceptions change, valuing diversity more and fearing it less, such resistance can be expected whenever transfer programs are seriously proposed.

There is another reason why unrestricted parental choice among public schools may be resisted: advocates of school desegregation may fear that permitting transfers for white students may open up a new avenue of "white flight". There is evidence to suggest that this fear may have some validity. Certainly some urban white parents would transfer their children to suburban schools if they had the opportunity. Whether race and school desegregation would be primary motivating factors is unclear, but the fact of transfers by white may be more important than the reasons in terms of its consequences for urban school desegregation. For

those urban school systems which are already predominantly minority, the answer may be that there are few white children left to lose. For those urban school systems which, like Syracuse, remain majority white and which have been very successful in achieving a racially balanced school system, the prospect of white transfers to the suburbs raises more difficult problems. Whether an unrestricted parental choice program would result in a more racially balanced situation county-wide, with black transfers to the suburbs and white transfers into the city counter-balancing white transfers to the suburbs, is difficult to predict.

Building capacity, transportation and funding issues would all have to be resolved before a program of parental choice among public schools could be implemented. Parental choice could be effectively nullified by school districts which claimed that their school buildings were full to capacity and which refused to add to that capacity. Just what "full to capacity" means, in view of urban-suburban discrepancies in class size, is a debatable issue. Incentives would have to be provided to school districts which received a net increase in enrollment through transfers to deal with capacity problems. In no case, however, should area residents be denied the opportunity of sending their children to their neighborhood schools because of transfers. As for transportation, the current fifteen mile limit on free transportation of private school students in New York State would seem to be a reasonable precedent for public school transfers across district lines, with the state assuming the cost of such transportation. Districts gaining or loosing enrollment as a result of transfers should have their state aid adjusted to reflect their incremental costs, although deciding just what those costs are may prove very difficult.

Whether or not a program of parental choice among public schools is implemented, there are other changes which need to be made, involving schools but also other community organizations and individuals.

First, in recognition of the fact that many parents do indeed make decisions about their children's school enrollment, boards of education should develop policies which would provide parents with as much information as possible, consistent with not interferring with instructional activities, and administrators, teachers and other school personnel should be trained to implement such policies. At present, some school administrators and teachers seek to limit the access of parents to school buildings, and this distancing behavior, which is described by Lightfoot (1978), is a contributing factor in some parents' lack of information or misinformation regarding schools. School staff should recognize that parents have a legitimate interest and an important role to play in the education of their children, and that openness and collaboration, though perhaps difficult at times, are more likely to result in positive student outcomes in the long run than distancing.

Secondly, parenting education programs dealing with parent-child activities, with parental activities in support of school instruction and with parental choice of school are worthy of support and should be expanded. All parents, regardless of level of education or income, can benefit from such programs. High schools can make a contribution in this area by offering parenting education classes for their students. But community organizations, such as religious groups and neighborhood centers, can also play a part in parenting education. In some instances, a home visitor program may be justified to bring parenting information to those who cannot or will not come to more public settings for such programs.

Thirdly, there remain major societal problems which need to be addressed, both by schools and by other community organizations. Why is it that high schools may teach the reasons for and consequences of the War of 1812 but at the same time consider it outside the scope of their responsibilities to discuss the reasons for and consequences of students attending one school rather than another? High

school students are competent to discuss such issues as employment opportunities, housing opportunities, standards of behavior and the responsibilities of parents. But while schools can and should address such issues, they did not create the problems and it is unreasonable to expect that they should deal with them alone. This is an area in which religious and other community organizations can and should play a leading role, bringing people from diverse backgrounds together to discuss the major problems that continue to divide us.

Finally, individual parents have both opportunities and responsibilities with respect to school enrollment. As noted above, some parents have more opportunities than others, but every parent should assume that they have some opportunities unless and until they have exhausted every conceivable alternative. To the extent that some parents have greater opportunities, they also have greater responsibilities, not only to their own children but also to the other children of their community. It is hard to disagree with Vivian Kite's assertion that she should not sacrifice her daughter's needs in order to create an ideal society. But I believe there are ways of thinking about the needs of one's own children and the needs of other children which presume less conflict and more mutual benefit, and ways of acting as parents that could result in a better life for all children. As parents and educators, we need to begin a dialogue about what those ways of thinking and acting might be.

Appendix A

1983-84 School Enrollment

Neighborhood	Neighborhood Public School	Other Public Schools	Catholic Schools	Other Private Schools
Old Town (N=71)	62%	25%	10%	3%
Parkside (N=17)	6%	35%	47%	12%
Hilltop (N=50)	8%	42%	50%	0%
The Village (N=40)	63%	5%	27%	5%
The Acres (N=49)	63%	6%	16%	14%

Notes: 1. Data gathered by means of door-to-door survey.

2. Old Town, Parkside and Hilltop are all in the same school attendance area. The Village is in another school attendance area, and The Acres in a third.

Appendix B

Residential Mobility

	Years at Current Address					Years in Syracuse		
Neighborhood	0-2	3-5	6-9	10-19	20+	0-5	6-19	20+
Old Town (N=50)	44%	32%	16%	6%	2%	16%	24%	60%
Parkside (N=15)	33%	7%	33%	27%	0%	13%	27%	60%
Hilltop (N=37)	22%	19%	27%	24%	8%	8%	27%	65%
The Village (N=28)	25%	29%	25%	21%	0%	7%	22%	71%
The Acres (N=32)	9%	31%	38%	16%	6%	12%	26%	62%
Total (N=162)	28%	26%	26%	17%	4%	12%	26%	62%
Families Interviewed								
Total (N=39)	41%	28%	23%	3%	0%	23%	23%	54%

Note: Data gathered by means of door-to-door survey.

Appendix C

Family Background Data

Neighborhood	Median Family Income	Modal Occupations		Median Education Completed		Median Years at Current Address
		Fathers	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	
Old Town (N=12)	$10,000-15,000	unskilled manual labor	sales/ clerical	did not complete high sch.	high school graduate	3
Parkside (N=4)	$25,000-30,000	sales/ skilled labor	sales	some college, < B.A.	some college, < B.A.	5
Hilltop (N=9)	$15,000-20,000	skilled manual labor	clerical/ homemaker	some college, < B.A.	some college, < B.A.	3
The Village (N=7)	$35,000-40,000	business	teacher/ homemaker	B.A. degree	B.A. degree	4
The Acres (N=7)	$45,000-50,000	business/ professional	homemaker	some graduate study	B.A. degree	4
TOTAL	$20,000-25,000	manual labor/ business	homemaker/ clerical/ sales	some college, < B.A.	some college, < B.A.	4

Note: Data gathered from interviews.

Appendix D

Home Purchase Prices

(April, 1984 to March, 1985)

Neighborhood	Median	Lowest	Highest
Old Town (N=2)	$24,000	$20,000	$28,000
Parkside (N=6)	$32,000	$16,000	$65,000
Hilltop (N=10)	$49,950	$32,500	$57,000
The Village (N=10)	$62,950	$46,500	$78,000
The Acres (N=9)	$85,000	$65,000	$145,000

Note: Data gathered from newspapers and real estate records.

References

Bridge, Gary, "Information Imperfections: The Achilles' Heel of Entitlement Plans", School Review (May 1978) Vol. 86, No. 3, pp. 504-29.

Bridge, Gary and Julie Blackman, A Study of Alternatives in American Education, Vol. IV: Family Choice in Schooling (Santa Monica, CA; Rand Corp., 1978).

Coleman, James S., "Quality and Equality in American Education: Public and Catholic Schools", Phi Delta Kappan (Nov. 1981) Vol. 63, No. 3, pp.159-64.

Darling-Hammond, Linda and Sheila Nataraj Kirby, "Public Policy and Private Choice: The Case of Minnesota" (unpublished, January 1985).

Fine, Benjamin and Lillian Fine, How to Get the Best Education for Your Child (Garden City, NY; Doubleday & Co., 1959, 1962).

Kirst, Michael W., "The Rationale for Public Schools", Phi Delta Kappan (Nov. 1981) Vol. 63, No. 3, pp. 164-5.

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence, Worlds Apart: Relationships Between Families and Schools (New York; Basic Books, Inc., 1978).

Magubane, Vukani, "Making the Right Moves", New York Times, Section 12, Education Fall Survey (Nov. 10, 1985) pp. 8-9.

National Governors' Association, Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education (Washington, DC; National Governors' Association, 1986)

Nault, Richard and Susan Uchitelle, "School Choice in the Public Sector: A Case Study of Parental Decision Making" in Michael E. Manley-Casimir, ed., Family Choice in Schooling (Lexington, MA; D.C. Heath & Co., 1982).

Reagan, Ronald, address to the National Association of Independent Schools, Feb. 28, 1985, Education Week (March 6, 1985) p. 30.

Rossi, Peter H., Why Families Move (Beverly Hills, CA; Sage Publications, 1980); (originally published in 1955 by Macmillan, New York).

Shanker, Albert, "The Making of a Profession", remarks before the Representative Assembly of the New York State United Teachers, April 27, 1985 (Washington, D.C.; American Federation of Teachers, 1985).

Simpson, George Eaton and J. Milton Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities: An Analysis of Prejudice and Discrimination, 5th ed. (New York; Plenum Press, 1985.

Wimpelberg, Robert K. "Parents and Sex Equity in Elementary Schools: Parental Preferences, Choise and Influence as They Relate to Schooling of Boys and Girls, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March, 1982.

Yinger, John, "Measuring Racial Discrimination with Fair Housing Audits: Caught in the Act", The American Economic Review (December, 1986) Vol. 76, No. 5, pp. 881-93.